IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. AT9-93-110

In re Application of:

88888

TIMOTHY MICHAEL SKERGAN

Serial No. 08/353,008

Examiner: UNKNOWN

Filed: DECEMBER 9, 1994

Art Unit: UNKNOWN

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR

MANIPULATING A PLURALITY OF GRAPHICAL POINTERS

STATEMENT SUPPORTING RENEWED PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The present Application, which was filed December 9, 1994, was the subject of an Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on September 24, 1997. A Decision on Appeal was mailed on June 19, 2001. At page 5 of the Decision on Appeal, the Board set forth a decision affirming the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 10-14 and reversing the rejection of independent Claim 6 and its dependent Claims 7-9. As a result, following the Decision on Appeal, Claims 1-5 and 10-14 remained under final rejection, and Claims 6-9 were in condition for allowance.

As set forth in MPEP 1214.06, entitled "Examiner Sustained in Whole or in Part," when the Board renders a decision leaving claims allowed (in this case Claims 6-9), "The appellant is not required to file a reply. The examiner issues the application ... on the claims which stand allowed" (emphasis supplied). The above-cited section of the MPEP further elucidates this procedure with the following example:

If the Board affirms a rejection of claim 1, claim 2 was objected to prior to appeal as being allowable except for its dependency from claim 1 and independent claim 3 is allowed, the examiner should cancel claims 1 and 2 and issue the application ... with claim 3 only.

Accordingly, in the present case, following the Decision on Appeal Applicant was not required to provide any reply to prosecute the present Application and was expecting to receive a Notice of Allowance on Claims 6-9.

Instead, Applicant received a Notice of Abandonment dated November 30, 2001, which stated that the present Application was abandoned in view of "[t]he decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences rendered on May 19, 2001 and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims" (emphasis supplied). Given the error in both date and status, Applicant took no action in response to the Notice of Abandonment when received. However, Applicant had no intention to abandon the present application.

In March 2007, the inventor Timothy Michael Skergan queried IBM Patent Counsel Casimer K. Salys regarding the status of the present Application. In response to the inventor's query, Mr. Salys discovered that the present Applicant had become abandoned through a failure of the Examiner to follow the clear procedure set forth in the MPEP for handling applications having allowable claims following a decision on appeal. Mr. Salys thereafter immediately requested the undersigned to undertake revival of the present Application.

In preparing to the accompanying Petition to Revive, I have carefully reviewed the file wrapper of the present Application and find no notation or other evidence that Applicant ever intended to abandon the present Application. Applicant's consistent, clear intention in pursuing prosecution and Appeal of the present Application was to have a patent issue on allowable Claims 6-9. Consequently, as set forth in the accompanying Petition to Revive, the entire delay from the abandonment of the Applicant until the filing of the accompanying Petition to Revive was unintentional.

In support of the accompanying Petition to Revive, Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137, the fee for the terminal disclaimer, and authorization to charge the issue fee to Applicant's deposit account. As indicated in MPEP 1214.06, no further reply is required by Applicant.

Please charge any additional fees associated with the present Petition to Revive as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this Application to IBM Corporation **Deposit** Account 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian F. Russell

Registration No. 40,796 DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Hwy. Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759 (512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT